DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 945 TM 840 258

AUTHOR Archer, Edith L.
TITLE Achievement Testing of the Handicapped Student: One School District's Experiences.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (68th, New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Tests; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Emotional Disturbances; Hearing Impairments; Learning Disabilities; Mental Retardation; Physical Disabilities; *School Districts; *Special Education; Special Health Problems; Speech Handicaps; *Testing Programs; Visual Impairments
IDENTIFIERS Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills; *Houston Independent School District TX; *Out of Level Testing

ABSTRACT

A large urban district [the Houston Independent School District], serving 17,000 handicapped students, initiated a special education achievement testing program to provide measures of student growth and group progress. A standardized test was selected that was both norm- and criterion-referenced and that matched the special education curriculum. Students were tested at the level at which they were functioning below, at, or above their grade placement level. Adaptive equipment or procedures were provided for all students requiring them. Over 16,000 students were tested. Analyses were carried out by handicapping condition and by functional level. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED243945

Achievement Testing of the Handicapped Student: One School District's Experiences

Edith L. Archer
Houston Independent School District

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E.L Archer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 840 258

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 23, 1984

Archer, Edith L.
Houston Independent School District

Achievement Testing of the Handicapped Student: One School District's Experiences

A large urban district serving 17,000 handicapped students initiated a special education achievement testing program to provide measures of student growth and group progress. A standardized test was selected that was both norm- and criterion-referenced and that matched the special education curriculum. Students were tested at the level at which they were functioning below, at, or above their grade placement level. Adaptive equipment or procedures were provided for all students requiring them. 16,330 students were tested. Analyses were carried out by handicapping condition and by functional level.

EA11/14ajb

INTRODUCTION

The decision to include handicapped students in achievement testing programs has been a difficult one. The problem has traditionally centered around the wide range of abilities possessed by handicapped students and the different approaches needed to provide for each handicap. In order to test students, many issues need to be considered (McCarthy, 1980):

1. Which students will be excused from testing programs?
2. How will tests be adapted for handicapped students?
3. Should persons administering and interpreting tests given to handicapped students be specially qualified?
4. Can handicapped students be tested in the district testing programs on their functional level rather than their grade placement level?

The move toward accountability in education seems to demand that some method of determining handicapped student growth and achievement be attempted. This measure of achievement should be related to district or state curricular goals (Gallagher and Hall, 1979). Without test scores, it is difficult to determine whether students are making progress in specific programs. It is therefore difficult to determine where program changes should be made. Olson (1980) says that "the current IEP process does not allow for provision of data on a general basis that describe the status of individuals

in special education programs in relationship to any common frame of reference or relative to non-handicapped children. Such isolation often contradicts the goal to move children across the continuum of environments." The most common disabilities present in the public schools are learning and language dysfunctions, mental retardation, orthopedic and muscular impairments, emotional disturbance, speech and hearing difficulties, visual impairment and chronic medical disorders. Some method of assessing the intellectual functioning of these students is needed; however, because these students are different from the standard test population, they are vulnerable to inappropriate administration and interpretation of standardized tests (Mearig, 1981).

BACKGROUND

In the spring of 1982, the Houston Independent School District special education staff decided that some method of measuring student growth was needed. The district serves 17,000 handicapped students on 240 campuses. Previous policy for testing handicapped students was determined by "teacher discretion." Any student who was two or more years below grade level could be tested on his functional level with an older form of the norm-referenced instrument used in the district-wide testing program. An analysis of 1981 and 1982 off-level results indicated that, because of the widely different ways the testing was being implemented, no evaluative information could be obtained. No data base had been established on which to make informed decisions about group achievement testing for handicapped students in the district. No statistical data or observational data on the testing process were available to provide the information needed to restructure or modify the district achievement testing program to include the handicapped.

In an effort to obtain information on initiating a testing program for handicapped students, a survey was sent to the top fifty school districts in the nation about their testing programs. Results of the survey indicated that most school districts were only minimally involved in group achievement testing of the handicapped.

The research department and the special education department reviewed the surveys and made an analysis of the Houston districtwide testing programs in which handicapped students were involved and made the following recommendations:

1. A criterion-referenced test that closely correlated with the district's curriculum for handicapped students was needed. The results of this test were to assist teachers in the planning and development of the students' Individual Education Programs (IEP).
2. A norm-referenced test that showed academic growth within an academic year was needed.
3. A more accurate identification of those handicapped students requiring off-level testing and those requiring on-level testing was needed.

Because the initiation of a special education testing program required a large amount of out-of-level testing, special consideration of the research in this area was required. Four issues were found to support the testing of students on their functional level: motivation, program evaluation, reliability of test scores, and curriculum match.

Motivation is a primary concern in student testing. If a student is given a test that is too difficult, it can be expected that he will become discouraged or frustrated and either quit responding or mark his answers

randomly. If test items are too easy, he may become bored or careless. Haynes and Cole (1982) found minimal support for the expectation that students would be less frustrated and more motivated by being tested at their functional level. Data on motivation is difficult to obtain because it depends on students' self reports; however, because a standardized test "samples" the skills or abilities of the students at the level for which the test is intended by the publisher, a student's performance on a test that is too difficult or too easy offers too few items from which to judge the students' academic ability.

The second issue that supports the use of out-of-level testing is program evaluation. Haenn (1981) reports that a large urban school district

> ...had a tremendous problem in detecting Title I gains which they were sure were present. Upon examination of existing testing measures, it was discovered that about 65-80 percent of the Title I students were scoring at the chance level providing tremendous noise in the evaluation measures and reducing the potential for showing Title I effects... The switch to functional level testing resulted in more accurate, albeit lower, pretest scores which allowed gains which were occurring to be measured.

The increased emphasis on the evaluation of special programs and the need to document growth of students being served in them makes consideration of out-of-level testing a necessity. In-level testing, if the levels are inappropriate, often fails to show the gains of students being instructed at their developmental level. Scores for special education and disadvantaged students are often unstable. Scores in gifted populations are often consistently at the upper end of the distribution. In both cases, growth

from year to year cannot be accurately assessed. Roberts (1976) contends that:

> No test measures exhaustively; it samples skills or abilities and it does so for the best and the poorest students simultaneously. Data from samples, as in the case of opinion polls, can yield quite accurate predictions, but the approximations are poorer when samples are smaller. Thus we need to ensure that the proportion of test material on which students can profitably spend time and effort does not drop too low--as it would if the test were much too difficult or far too easy.

The third issue that supports the use of out-of-level testing is reliability. Scores are more reliable at the center of the distribution which, theoretically, is where a student tested on his functional level will score. Ayrer and McNamara (1973) found that out-of-level testing provides a more reliable estimate of the true achievement of students. In his 1976 article, Yoshida said that "out-of-level testing appears successful in presenting test items to special education students in a way which effectively controls guessing, and increases the likelihood of scores based upon how much students comprehend."

In contrast, Jones and others (1983) found that, for mildly handicapped students, there were no substantial increases in reliability with out-of-level testing. His study, however, was conducted with a sample of students who generally scored above chance on the in-level test. Haynes and Cole (1982) found that "the use of the below-level functional test did reduce the proportion of students scoring below chance for the reading and math subtests." In addition, "the proportion of students who scored above the

ceiling level was smaller in most cases, as expected, for those testing above level (presumably nearer their functional level) than for those testing on-level." (Haynes and Cale, 1982)

The fourth issue supporting the use of out-of-level testing with handicapped students is the match between the student's instructional level and his test level. Coffman, in a 1979 paper, expressed the following concerns:

> Unfortunately, the concept that pupils in a particular grade in school should be learning the same things (and should be tested on them) is so strong that it is difficult to communicate to the lay public, or even to many teachers and administrators, the rationale for out-of-level testing. Those responsible for evaluating educational programs for disadvantaged and minority students must take responsibility for solving this communication problem if sound evaluation procedures are to be used. Unfortunately, many find it easier to continue using inappropriate "in-level" tests which often fail to show the real gains that result from new programs that focus instruction at the appropriate developmental level of the pupils.

If a student's achievement is considerably below his grade level, it has been shown that an out-of-level test may indeed be more reflective of his curriculum than an in-level test. In addition, very little diagnostic information is obtained for students who are tested at a different level from that at which they are being taught.

The four issues presented in the preceeding sections supported the use of out-of-level testing in the Houston district; however, before a final decision was reached, the issues of comparability of scores and depression of grade equivalents had to be addressed.

The ability to compare the scores between out-of-level and in-level tests is related to the vertical equating techniques used by test publishers to link levels of a test. In an out-of-level testing program, students' scores are compared to "in-level" norms, so it is critical that vertical equating be adequate. Several studies have pointed out that the vertical equating of many standardized test batteries does not always allow comparability of scores (Arter, 1982; Loyd and Hoover, 1980; Jones, 1983; Applebaum, 1979). However, most of the problems with vertical scaling occur in the unreliable extreme portions of the distribution and increase in severity as the distance between levels increases. If students are leveled appropriately, if the test content is correct for each student, and if the vertical scaling has been carried out by an experienced test publisher, the problems with scaling should be weighed against the benefits of providing students a mechanism for displaying their knowledge. "If test levels are assigned to be within the relevant range of the student's ability, the grade equivalents obtained on any of the levels would appear to be sufficiently close for most practical comparisons" (Applebaum, 1979).

Another consideration in the comparability of scores is the use of an inappropriate norm group. No national norms exist for handicapped students, though some publishers include some number of these students in their sample. Many researchers have expressed the need for out-of-level norm groups (Haenn, 1981; Ayrer and McNamara, 1973; Arter, 1982; Cleland and Idstein, 1980; Slaughter and Gallas, 1978; Coffman, 1979).

A second consideration in the decision to go to an out-of-level testing program is the depression of grade equivalents. Research has shown that grade equivalents are depressed when a district moves from minimal out-of-level testing to a large scale program. The reason for this depression appears to be that the "floor" of a test is removed by the use of a lower level test. For a higher level test (for example, level 8) the G.E. associated with chance might be 2.4. For level 6 (an easier test), the G.E. associated with chance might be 1.4. A low functioning student might score between the two chance grade equivalents even if level 6 were his appropriate test level. If a number of students in the district were to fall in this range, the overall district scores would be lower, though the measure of academic achievement would be more accurate.

In a 1982 paper, Arter reflected:

> It is interesting to note that evidence of decreasing grade equivalents has been taken as both supportive of and a blow to issues of whether results are comparable. On the one hand, if out-of-level and in-level tests yield different GEs, then scores are not comparable. On the other hand, in most studies, functional level testing was begun because it was seen that in-level tests were too hard and a floor effect resulted. Therefore, the decrease in GEs would seem a natural by-product of the removal of the floor.

PLANNING THE PROGRAM

The testing program in the Houston District was designed to provide criterion-referenced information to assist teachers in planning and to provide norm-referenced information that could show academic growth within a year. The primary function of the assessment program is to build a

data base so that individual student achievement can be followed. Though students are compared with norm groups and to each other for purposes of reporting, the primary emphasis of the project is diagnostic; therefore, problems associated with vertical scaling are not as critical. A second major function is to allow, after several years of testing, a method of determining the growth that can be expected for students with different handicaps. Because this information does not now exist, it is difficult to evaluate special education programs, students and teachers. Because no summary data existed, the political implications of depressed performance indices were not an issue.

Once the decision to begin the special education testing program was made, a test was selected by a committee of special educators. The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills - Form U was chosen for the following reasons:

1. The test objectives closely matched the special education curriculum.
2. The test provided both norm-referenced and criterion-referenced information.
3. Special education students were included in the norming sample; however, there were no separate norms for the handicapped.
4. The publisher provided both locator tests and practice tests which were necessary to implement an out-of-level program.
5. The publisher had available a three parameter scoring model.
6. The test was a full range achievement battery with vertical scaling adequate to meet the requirements of the project.

All students with a special education label who were functioning at kindergarten level and above were tested at their functional level. For the first year of testing, no limits were established concerning the number of levels "off" his age/grade placement the student could be tested. Schools were provided with computer lists of the special education students enrolled and any previous achievement test data available on the district's master computer file. These scores, plus any individual test data in the student's special education assessment file, were used to aid teachers in determining a test level for each student.

A special consideration for placing learning disabled students at the appropriate test level was the typical problem of widely divergent reading and math abilities. When the reading level was used as an indicator of test level, the math score was expected to hit the ceiling of the test. This problem was difficult to avoid because the subtests are all printed in one booklet and because scoring and reporting requires expensive customizing by the testing company.

Studies conducted on teacher judgement in assigning test levels generally support the contention that teachers can place students fairly accurately (Yoshida, 1976; Haynes and Cole, 1982). Additional studies have found that locator tests may underestimate student achievement level (Cleland and Idstein, 1980; Slaughter and Gallas, 1978). In the Houston project, the decision was made to allow teacher judgement to override other methods of establishing test levels. Though most students were tested below their actual grade level, a portion of the population was given tests at and above their grade level. Speech impaired, pregnant, and other mainstreamed students in special education were included in the testing at their age/grade placement level in order to provide baseline data on the

entire population and to provide a method of equating the instrument with other standardized tests administered in the districtwide testing program.

IMPLEMENTING THE PROGRAM

Table 1 gives the percent of the 13,401 students who took the test above grade level, at grade level, and below grade level by primary handicapping condition. Table 2 shows the number and percent of students taking each level of the CTBS-U at and above grade level.

When a large special testing program is implemented, special arrangements need to be made for handling the administration of the test. Students taking the tests have to be grouped according to their test level rather than their grade placement. Because Houston's special education testing occurred during the same two weeks as its citywide testing program, only a limited number of classrooms and proctors were available. In order to help with the program, special education nonteaching staff were assigned to each of the 240 schools to help plan testing schedules, organize and order materials, coordinate testing activities and batch materials for scoring. These test coordinators served as a liaison between the school and the assessment office.

Three workshops were held for the test coordinators. The first workshop was held two months preceeding testing to describe the project and the theoretical basis of out-of-level testing. This workshop also included instruction in selection of test levels and in the completion of material order forms, test scheduling sheets, and other pertinent documents related to the program. The second workshop took place immediately preceeding testing and handled practical matters such as training teachers to give the tests, test security, and batching the materials for scoring.

Table 1

Percent of Students by Primary
Handicapping Condition Taking
CTBS-U above, at, or below Grade Placement

	above age/grade placement	at age/ grade placement	1 yr. below age/grade placement	2 yrs. below age/grade placement	more than 2 yrs below age/grade placement
Learning Disabled (n=8869)	0.4%	14.7%	24.7%	21.2%	39.0%
Speech Handicapped (n=2172)	2.6%	64.8%	16.8%	8.5%	7.3%
Mentally Retarded (n=1331)	0	2.7%	7.0%	12.9%	77.4%
Emotionally Disturbed (n=366)	1.5%	25.3%	19.8%	18.3%	35.1%
Hearing Impaired (n=202)	0	6.3%	7.5%	13.8%	72.4%
Orthopedically Handicapped (n=172)	0	36.6%	13.1%	6.2%	44.1%
Pregnant (n=141)	0	100%	0	0	0
Other Health Impaired (n=72)	1.7%	44.1%	18.6%	10.2%	25.4%
Visually Handicapped (n=65)	1.6%	31.7%	11.7%	26.7%	28.3%
Multiply Handicapped (n=8)	0	0	0	0	100%
Autistic (n=3)	0	0	0	0	100%

EA12-19pah

Table 2

Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills
Number and Percent of Students Functionally
Tested at Each Test Level

	No. students taking test level*	No. and % of students taking test level below actual grade placement	No. and % of students taking test level at or above actual grade placement
Test Level A (Kindergarten)	1326	not provided	not provided
Test Level B (Grade 1)	2636	1987 (75%)	649 (25%)
Test Level D (Grade 2)	3093	2501 (81%)	592 (19%)
Test Level E (Grade 3)	2600	2157 (83%)	443 (17%)
Test Level F (Grade 4)	1859	1553 (83%)	306 (17%)
Test Level G (Grade 5-6)	1292	838 (65%)	454 (35%)
Test Level H (Grade 7-8)	345	135 (39%)	210 (61%)
Test Level J (Grade 9-12)	250	0	250 (100%)
TOTAL	13,401		

* This number includes all students who took the given test level at grades K-12.

EA11/17c1a

The third workshop was held after the tests were scored and reports were returned. The test publisher's representatives provided training in using the scores to plan instruction, write IEPs, and organize programs.

In order to implement a testing program for handicapped students, many adaptations had to be made. Large-print and braille versions were reproduced with the permission of the publisher. These students' responses were transferred to standard answer sheets for scoring. In order to test the hearing impaired, teachers of the deaf agreed upon standard American Sign Language instructions so that the administration for all students would be the same. Students with severe orthopedic impairments were provided a proctor to mark their answers or were allowed to type their answers. Timing constraints were relaxed for these three groups—the visually impaired, the hearing impaired and the orthopedically handicapped.

All students were given practice tests before being allowed to take the CTBS. Mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed students who were unable to tolerate the testing situation during practice testing did not participate in the regular administration. Some students were only able to take the test in a one-on-one situation, which was provided when possible. Teachers were asked to readjust test levels, if necessary, based on practice test results.

Because the program was part of districtwide testing, the administration was done in the spring. Though fall testing would have been more appropriate from a diagnostic-instructional point of view, special educators surveyed after the administration felt that being a part of the districtwide program in the spring was preferable to a separate fall testing. Materials were ordered by the school through the central materials department, as in

other testing programs. The return of materials and the batching for scoring was different because the program was out-of-level. Materials were shipped to the scorer in batches based on the in-level norms that were to be used for reporting.

Three score reports were received from the publisher - a school report, an individual report and two labels--one for parents and one for the student's permanent record folder. The school report provided a list of students by age/grade placement and provided national and local percentile ranks. Grade equivalents were purposely not provided because of concern that they would be misused. Appendix A provides test results by primary handicapping condition.

Individual student reports included national and local percentile ranks, grade equivalents, and individual objectives mastery data. These reports are used to write IEPs and to plan student instruction. The CTBS-U objectives were correlated to instructional materials at all levels and have been incorporated into the special education curriculum guides.

YEAR TWO OF THE PROGRAM

Handicapped students were tested a second time on CTBS-U in March 1984. Several changes were made in the testing program for the second year. Students' test levels were preassigned based on their previous year's in-level percentile rank in reading. Teacher judgement was allowed to override the level when it was thought to be inappropriate. If the student was totally mainstreamed, he was dropped from the special education testing program. Totally mainstreamed was defined as receiving no instruction in a special education classroom. Students receiving only speech

services or only transportation and consultation were the groups most affected by the new policy. They were returned to the citywide program unless their parents requested otherwise. Visually impaired students who were totally mainstreamed remained in the special education testing program because the citywide program did not provide braille or large print tests.

A second group of students, those who were determined to be extremely low-functioning, were also dropped from testing. These students had created logistical problems during the first year of testing because they needed small group or individual administration. If their scores were at chance or below, they were dropped from testing.

When the 1984 scores are returned, work will begin on determining a growth score for each student who has taken the test twice. Additional consideration will also be given to developing local norms for handicapped students.

Year two of special education testing went very smoothly. The project has become an integral part of the assessment program in Houston. Parents, teachers, and principals are pleased to have what appears to be valid information about previously untested students. Researchers look forward to obtaining data about handicapped students and what expectations can be had of them as they progress in school.

The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Mikel Brightman in the preparation of this paper and in the coordination of the CTBS testing program.

REFERENCES

Applebaum, W. R. Effects of off-level assignment on ITBS grade equivalent scores. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April, 1979.

Arter, J. A. Out-of-level versus in-level testing: when should we recommend each? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, march, 1982.

Ayrer, J. E. and T. C. McNamara. Survey testing on an out-of-level basis. Journal of Educational Measurement. 10(2), Summer, 1973.

Cleland, W. E. and P. M. Idstein. In-level versus out-of-level testing for sixth grade special education students. Paper presented at the annual meeting of National Council for Measurement in Education, Boston, April, 1980.

Coffman, W. E. Classical test development solutions. Iowa Testing Programs Occasional Papers. Number 23, February, 1979.

Easton, J. Q. and E. D. Washington. The Effects of functional level testing on five new standardized reading achievement tests. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March, 1982.

Gallagher, J. and J. Hall. The benefits of competency testing for the exceptional student. Boothwyn PA: Education Unlimited, 1979, 1, 71-72.

Haenn, J. F. A Practitioner's guide to functional level testing. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April, 1981.

Haynes, L. T. and N. S. Cole. Testing some assumptions about on-level versus out-of-level achievement testing. Paper presented at the annual meeting of National Council on Measurement in Education. New York, March, 1982.

Jones, E. D. and others. Out-of-level testing for special education students with mild learning handicaps. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Montreal, April, 1983.

Loyd, B. H. and H. D. Hoover. Vertical equating using the Rasch model. Journal of Educational Measurement, 17 (3), Fall, 1980.

McCarthy, M. Minimum competency testing and handicapped students. Exceptional Children, 1980, 47, 166-173.

Mearig, J. The Role of tests in assessing intellectual functioning of children with special needs. Peabody Journal of Education, 1981, 58, 108-18.

Olsen, K. Minimum competency testing and the IEP process. Exceptional Children, 1980, 47, 176-183.

Plake, B. S. and H. D. Hoover. The Comparability of equal raw scores obtained from in-level and out-of-level testing: one source of the discrepancy between in level and out-of-level grade equivalent scores. Journal of Educational Measurement. 16 (4), Winter, 1979.

Roberts, A. O. Out-of-level testing. ESEA Title I Evaluation and Reporting System. Technical Paper no. 6, October, 1976.

Slaughter, H. B. and E. J. Gallas. Will out-of-level norm-referenced testing improve the selection of program participants and the diagnosis of reading comprehension in ESEA Title I programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March, 1978.

Yoshida, R. K. Out-of-level testing of special education students with a standardized achievement battery. Journal of Educational Measurement. 13 (3), Fall, 1976.

Appendix A

Average National Percentile Ranks
Actual Grade by Test Level
Reading and Mathematics
Visually Handicapped

Actual Grade	Test Level * D R	D M	E R	E M	F R	F M	G R	G M	H R	H M	J R	J M
1												
2	2.5 n=2	9.5 n=2										
3			49. n=1	84. n=1								
4	12. n=3	1.3 n=3	10. n=3	8. n=3	44.5 n=2	25.5 n=2						
5			3. n=5	7. n=5	30. n=1	20. n=1						
6	1. n=1	1. n=1	6.5 n=2	1. n=2	20. n=3	10. n=3	86. n=3	76. n=3				
7	1. n=1	1. n=1	4. n=1	1. n=1	32.5 n=2	37.5 n=2						
8	1. n=1	1. n=1					77. n=1	65. n=1	48.5 n=4	45.5 n=4	94. n=1	
9							4. n=1	30. n=1	69. n=1	30. n=1		
10							3. n=1	5. n=1			37.5 n=2	n=1
11					1. n=1	1. n=1			4. n=1	1. n=1	52. n=1	30. n=1
12							3.5 n=2	3.5 n=2			79.5 n=2	40.5 n=2

N = 49
VH taking levels A & B = 16
TOTAL 65

Figures above the heavy line indicate students tested at or above their actual grade placement.

* National percentile ranks are not available for students tested with levels A and B.

EA11/13ajb

Average National Percentile Ranks
Actual Grade by Test Level
Reading and Mathematics
Speech Handicapped

Actual Grade	Test Level* D R	D M	E R	E M	F R	F M	G R	G M	H R	H M	J R	J M
1	73.5 n=14	61.5 n=14										
2	34.7 n=304	48.3 n=306	76. n=11	82. n=11								
3	14.5 n=82	8. n=83	34.4 n=209	48. n=209	63. n=9	85.8 n=9	61. n=1	63. n=1				
4	11.4 n=47	11.3 n=47	14.3 n=74	17.3 n=75	31.5 n=150	47.3 n=149	91.5 n=6	88.5 n=6				
5	1.4 n=17	11. n=17	9. n=37	8. n=37	21.8 n=54	29.5 n=54	31.5 n=104	55. n=103	86. n=1	98. n=1		
6	1.8 n=9	1.1 n=9	3.5 n=14	1.5 n=14	11.5 n=24	13. n=24	25.8 n=61	32.3 n=61	69.5 n=10	77. n=9	92. n=1	94. n=1
7	1.5 n=2	1. n=2	5.5 n=4	7. n=4	13.5 n=8	5.5 n=8	20. n=15	21.2 n=14	68. n=23	65.8 n=23	82.5 n=2	94. n=1
8			1.3 n=10	1.3 n=10	6.8 n=9	4.3 n=9	12.5 n=24	13. n=25	31. n=15	46. n=15	87. n=5	91.5 n=4
9	1. n=3	1. n=3	1. n=5	1. n=5	2.5 n=4	2.5 n=4	2. n=3	6. n=3	11.5 n=2	2.5 n=2	27. n=3	34. n=3
10			1. n=4	1. n=4	5. n=5	8. n=5			1.5 n=2	12.5 n=2	67. n=1	61. n=1
11	1. n=1	1. n=1	1. n=3	1. n=3	1. n=3	1. n=3	1. n=1	34. n=1	21. n=1	10. n=1		
12					1.5 n=2	13.5 n=2	1. n=2	1.5 n=2	8. n=1	27. n=1	12. n=1	17. n=1

N = 1408
SH taking levels A & B = 764
TOTAL 2172

Figures above the heavy line indicate students tested at or above their actual grade placement.

* National percentile ranks are not available for students tested with levels A and B.

Average National Percentile Ranks
Actual Grade by Test Level
Reading and Mathematics
Orthopedically Handicapped

Actual Grade	Test Level * D R	D M	E R	E M	F R	F M	G R	G M	H R	H M	J R	J M
1												
2	28. n=3	28. n=3										
3	14. n=1	3. n=1	34.5 n=4	19.5 n=4								
4	16. n=1	1.5 n=2	4. n=3	2. n=3	70 n=3	56 n=3						
5	6. n=5	1.1 n=5	7. n=3	4. n=3	11.5 n=4	10.5 n=4	25. n=1	39. n=1				
6	1. n=2	1. n=2	1.3 n=3	1.3 n=3	22. n=1	1. n=1	43. n=7	36.8 n=7				
7	1.2 n=4	1. n=4			19. n=13	1.5 n=2	21. n=7	16. n=7	47.5 n=6	32.5 n=6		
8					14. n=1	2. n=1			31. n=11	28. n=11		
9			1. n=2	1. n=2	1.3 n=6	1. n=5	1.5 n=2	3.5 n=2			24.5 n=4	24.5 n=4
10			1.2 n=4	1. n=4	1. n=1	1. n=1	1. n=2	1. n=2	n=1	n=1	24.5 n=2	42. n=3
11	1. n=1	1. n=1	1. n=1	1. n=1	11. n=1	8. n=1	n=1	n=1	1.5 n=2	1.5 n=2	17. n=5	37. n=5
12	1. n=1	45. n=1	1. n=1	1. n=1			3. n=1	1. n=1	1. n=1	1. n=1	16.5 n=2	17.5 n=2

N = 126
OH taking levels A & B = 46
TOTAL 172

Figures above the heavy line indicate students tested at or above their actual grade placement.

* National percentile ranks are not available for students tested with levels A and B.

Average National Percentile Ranks
Actual Grade by Test Level
Reading and Mathematics
Mentally Retarded

Actual Grade	Test Level * D		E		F		G		H		J	
	R	M	R	M	R	M	R	M	R	M	R	M
1												
2	4.5 n=6	1.5 n=6										
3	4.7 n=23	1.2 n=23	3.5 n=2	3.5 n=2								
4	3.3 n=29	1.2 n=31	7.5 n=8	1.5 n=8	4. n=1	14. n=1						
5	1.2 n=34	1.1 n=35	4.5 n=18	1.1 n=18	5.5 n=4	7.5 n=4	26. n=1	3. n=1				
6	1.0 n=37	1.1 n=38	1.3 n=28	1.0 n=29	3.5 n=12	3. n=12	2.5 n=4	5.5 n=4				
7	1.1 n=30	1. n=29	1.2 n=32	1. n=32	1.3 n=11	1.3 n=11	1. n=1	9. n=1	2. n=1	5. n=1		
8	1. n=26	1. n=26	1. n=19	1. n=19	1.1 n=7	1.1 n=7	5.8 n=8	2. n=8	3. n=1	2. n=1		
9	1. n=22	1. n=22	1. n=26	1. n=26	1.1 n=12	1.1 n=12	1.2 n=4	1. n=4	12. n=1	2. n=1	87. n=1	67. n=1
10	1. n=21	1. n=21	1. n=12	1. n=11	1.2 n=4	1. n=4	1. n=5	1. n=5				
11	1. n=28	1. n=27	1. n=20	1. n=20	1. n=9	1. n=8	1. n=5	1. n=5				
12	1. n=21	1. n=20	1. n=15	1. n=16	1.2 n=7	1.1 n=7	1.3 n=5	1.1 n=5				

N = 567
MR taking levels A & B = 764
TOTAL 1331

Figures above the heavy line indicate students tested at or above their actual grade placement.

* National percentile ranks are not available for students tested with levels A and B.

Average National Percentile Ranks
Actual Grade by Test Level
Reading and Mathematics
Pregnant

Actual Grade	Test Level * D R	D M	E R	E M	F R	F M	G R	G M	H R	H M	J R	J M
1												
2												
3												
4												
5												
6											18.5 n=2	7.5 n=2
7									18.0 n=1	28.0 n=1	24.0 n=5	18.0 n=5
8									18.0 n=9	19.8 n=9		
9											14.0 n=23	24.0 n=23
10											11.8 n=30	23.0 n=30
11											14.0 n=40	24.5 n=40
12											14.8 n=31	22.3 n=31

N = 141

Figures above the heavy line indicate students tested at or above their actual grade placement.

* National percentile ranks are not available for students tested with levels A and B.

Average National Percentile Ranks
Actual Grade by Test Level
Reading and Mathematics
Learning Disabled

Actual Grade	Test Level * D R	D M	E R	E M	F R	F M	G R	G M	H R	H M	J R	J M
1	34. n=13	74.3 n=11										
2	22.8 n=229	41.3 n=228	36. n=1	65. n=1								
3	12.9 n=551	14.1 n=553	31. n=205	45.5 n=206	65. n=5	69.3 n=5						
4	6.1 n=494	9.9 n=495	16.3 n=421	18.7 n=425	35. n=119	43. n=119	69.8 n=3	66. n=3				
5	1.4 n=366	2.1 n=367	8.3 n=430	8.6 n=442	20.2 n=296	23.2 n=296	40. n=75	46.5 n=74				
6	1.3 n=170	1.4 n=169	3.2 n=283	1.9 n=283	11.8 n=294	9.6 n=291	26. n=167	21.8 n=163	53.5 n=6	62.5 n=6	89. n=1	79. n=1
7	1.1 n=104	1.2 n=104	2.3 n=165	1.3 n=167	9.4 n=233	6.9 n=232	19.4 n=177	13.9 n=177	39.8 n=37	29. n=35		
8	1.1 n=87	1.2 n=87	1.2 n=133	1.2 n=132	4.7 n=160	4.1 n=159	11.4 n=172	11.2 n=172	33.5 n=66	23.5 n=64	88. n=6	34.5 n=6
9	1. n=46	1.2 n=46	1. n=93	1.1 n=94	1.2 n=111	1.3 n=109	4.5 n=130	4. n=130	13.7 n=51	9.9 n=51	26.5 n=18	21.5 n=18
10	1. n=23	1. n=22	1. n=67	1. n=69	1.1 n=90	1.3 n=90	1.4 n=73	2.3 n=74	6. n=20	10.5 n=20	20. n=13	14. n=13
11	1. n=26	1. n=27	1. n=64	1.1 n=70	1.3 n=70	1.4 n=71	1.5 n=76	2. n=75	6.6 n=23	7.5 n=22	58. n=9	18. n=9
12	1. n=22	1. n=22	1. n=41	1.1 n=39	1.1 n=40	1.3 n=40	1.8 n=61	3.2 n=62	4. n=22	7.8 n=21	11. n=15	23. n=15

N = 6709
LD taking levels A & B = 2160
TOTAL 8869

Figures above the heavy line indicate students tested at or above their actual grade placement.

* National percentile ranks are not available for students tested with levels A and B.

Average National Percentile Ranks
Actual Grade by Test Level
Reading and Mathematics
Hearing Impaired

Actual Grade	Test Level * D R	D M	E R	E M	F R	F M	G R	G M	H R	H M	J R	J M
1												
2	47. n=3	45. n=3										
3	10.5 n=6	4. n=6										
4	3.5 n=6	8.5 n=6	13.5 n=2	27.5 n=2	18.5 n=2	3.5 n=2						
5	1.1 n=6	1.3 n=6	7. n=1	12. n=1	17. n=1	16. n=1	36. n=1	69. n=1				
6	1.1 n=6	1.1 n=6			12. n=3	16. n=3						
7	1.1 n=6	1.5 n=6	2.5 n=6	1.1 n=6			9. n=1	12. n=1				
8	1.0 n=5	1.1 n=5	1. n=1	1. n=1					2. n=1	27. n=1		
9	1. n=10	1. n=10	1. n=4	1.2 n=4	1. n=1	36. n=1			9.5 n=2	8.5 n=2		
10	1.0 n=6	1.1 n=5	1. n=1	1. n=1			3.5 n=2	1. n=2				
11	1. n=14	1. n=14	1. n=1	1. n=1	1. n=1	2. n=1	1.5 n=4	7.5 n=4				
12	1. n=11	1. n=11	1. n=5	1.1 n=5	1. n=1	1. n=1	1. n=2	3.5 n=2				

N = 122
HI taking levels A & B = 80
TOTAL 202

Figures above the heavy line indicate students tested at or above their actual grade placement.

* National percentile ranks are not available for students tested with levels A and B.

Average National Percentile Ranks
Actual Grade by Test Level
Reading and Mathematics
Other Health Impared

Actual Grade	Test Level * D R	D M	E R	E M	F R	F M	G R	G M	H R	H M	J R	J M
1												
2	8.5 n=4	14.5 n=4										
3	5.0 n=3	2.0 n=3	10.5 n=2	4.5 n=2								
4	7.5 n=2	9.5 n=2	16.5 n=2	23.5 n=2	62.5 n=2	90.5 n=2						
5	1.0 n=2	1.5 n=2	8.5 n=2	7.5 n=2	33.0 n=3	42.0 n=3	3.5 n=2	12.5 n=2				
6	1.0 n=1	1.0 n=1	10.0 n=1	2.0 n=1					39.0 n=1	7.0 n=1		
7												
8	1.0 n=1	1.0 n=1			1.0 n=1	2.0 n=1	28.0 n=1	10.0 n=1	32.0 n=5	28.0 n=5		
9			1.0 n=2	1.0 n=2	1.0 n=1	1.0 n=1						
10			1.0 n=1	1.0 n=1			1.5 n=2	14.5 n=2			20.0 n=1	9.0 n=1
11			1.0 n=2	1.0 n=2			4.0 n=1	22.0 n=1			64.5 n=4	39.5 n=4
12												

N = 49
OHI taking levels A & B = 23
TOTAL 72

Figures above the heavy line indicate students tested at or above their actual grade placement.

* National percentile ranks are not available for students tested with levels A and B.

Average National Percentile Ranks
Actual Grade by Test Level
Reading and Mathematics
Emotionally Disturbed

Actual Grade	Test Level* D R	D M	E R	E M	F R	F M	G R	G M	H R	H M	J R	J M
1												
2	24.5 n=12	48.5 n=12										
3	4.8 n=14	8.5 n=14	30. n=7	53. n=7								
4	10.5 n=14	12.5 n=14	24.5 n=14	16.3 n=15	41. n=13	48. n=13						
5	1.2 n=8	1.1 n=8	6.5 n=8	2.2 n=8	12. n=9	16. n=9	29.5 n=8	32.5 n=8				
6	1.1 n=10	1.2 n=10	18. n=5	7.8 n=5	12.5 n=12	11.5 n=12	44. n=10	16.5 n=10	75.5 n=2	27.5 n=2		
7	1.8 n=7	1.2 n=7	7. n=1	1. n=1	7.5 n=4	1.5 n=4	8. n=7	1.4 n=7	70. n=5	77. n=5	78. n=1	
8	1. n=3	1.3 n=3	1.2 n=4	1.2 n=4	13. n=3	1.5 n=2	12.3 n=9	7. n=9	37. n=5	27. n=5	91.5 n=2	65.5 n=2
9	1. n=2	1. n=2	1. n=1	1. n=1	1.5 n=4	1.2 n=4	10.5 n=8	3.5 n=8	1. n=1	21. n=1	50.5 n=4	56.5 n=4
10			1. n=1	1. n=1	1. n=1	1. n=1	1.3 n=10	2.5 n=10	9. n=1	29. n=1	34.5 n=6	14.5 n=6
11	1. n=1	1. n=1	1. n=1	1. n=2	1. n=3	1.3 n=3	11.5 n=4	1.5 n=4	7. n=1	27. n=1	21. n=3	25. n=3
12	1. n=1	1. n=1	1. n=3	1. n=3	1. n=1	1. n=1	1.3 n=3	1.3 n=3	25. n=1	11. n=1	49.5 n=2	31.5 n=2

N = 262
ED taking levels A & B = 104
TOTAL 366

Figures above the heavy line indicate students tested at or above their actual grade placement.

* National percentile ranks are not available for students tested with levels A and B.